

DOI: 10.26565/2227-6521-2022-49-02

УДК: 316.472.4

**STUDYING INTEGRATION PROCESSES IN LOCAL LABOR COMMUNITIES: BETWEEN INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE (BASED ON THE THEORIES BY M. GRANOVETTER, S. EISENSTADT, AND A. HONNETH)**

**Prystupa Mariia** – Master in Sociology, PhD student, Department of Sociology, V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, 4, Svobody sq., Kharkiv 61022, Ukraine, e-mail: mariia.prystupa@karazin.ua, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1556-8822>

*In the article, theoretical provisions by M. Granovetter, S. Eisenstadt, and A. Honneth regarding the interrelation between interpersonal relationships and social structure are analyzed. It is underlined that these provisions can be used for studying transformation processes in local labor communities under the conditions of capitalistic globalization and technological advancement since it is reasonable to suggest that in this situation such communities will gradually lose their integrative function. The selected approaches are reviewed in order to identify the elements of social relations, which they consider the most significant and the ways they connect these elements. Similarities and differences between the discussed theories are analyzed, as well as the possibilities of their integration into a single conceptual framework. A number of aspects of social relations that all the three researchers consider significant are outlined, which are the following: trust, involvement (or active recognition of the counterpart's social significance), domination / submission relations and the establishment of compliance. The interconnection between these aspects is outlined also. It is concluded that the discussed theories can be integrated without contradictions into a single conceptual framework for studying social integration processes. Moreover, different scopes suggested by the researchers complement each other which allow elaborating a complex notion of these processes. The possibilities of application of such conceptual framework for studying integration processes in local labor communities are discussed. It is argued that it is adequate for studying social transformations resulting from the inconsistencies between physical and social topology. Perspectives of further research are outlined, including the effects of the above on solidarity in labor communities and their social and political agency, as well as the balance between intentionality and contingency in social change.*

**Keywords:** integrative function of labor, M. Granovetter's, S. Eisenstadt's, and A. Honneth 's theories, interpersonal relationships, social structure, social integration, integrative function of labor.

---

*Для цитування:* Prystupa M. Studying Integration Processes in Local Labor Communities: between Interpersonal Communication and Social Structure (based on the Theories by M. Granovetter, S. Eisenstadt, and A. Honneth). *Вісник Харківського національного університету імені В. Н. Каразіна. Серія Соціологічні дослідження сучасного суспільства*. 2022. 49. С. 19-25. doi: 10.26565/2227-6521-2022-49-05

---

*How to Cite:* Prystupa, M. (2022) 'Studying Integration Processes in Local Labor Communities: Between Interpersonal Communication and Social Structure (Based on the Theories by M. Granovetter, S. Eisenstadt, and A. Honneth)' *Visnyk of V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University. Series Sociological Studies of Contemporary Society: Methodology, Theory, methods* (49), 19-25. doi: 10.26565/2227-6521-2022-49-05

---

**Identifying the problem.** Labor relationships involve common activity, shared physical space, similar socioeconomic and cultural background of the workers on close positions. These features create an environment for the formation of interpersonal relationships and local labor communities affecting person's social integration in the wider scope. Under the conditions of capitalistic globalization and technological advancement, contemporary labor relationships transform toward diminishing their consolidating influence. The introduction of new technologies increases labor productivity and allows substitution of human workers with automated labor force to decrease production costs. Moreover, the extensive automation decreases the total need for human labor [1]. This means that the frequency of human-to-human interaction within the labor process decreases. In addition, human-human interaction tends to become sporadic and short-term due to the increasing flexibility of the labor market [2]. Thus, common activity is gradually eliminated from labor.

The expansion of the alternative forms of employment and work schedule (part-time, off-hour, flexible, temporary, overtime, remote, etc.) results in desynchronization of workers' labor routines and diminishes their simultaneous presence at the same place [1]. The extensive implementation of electronic documentation and digital platforms for business communication decreases the frequency of face-to-face interactions.

Since the connections between employers and employees also become sporadic, they lose interest in

supporting long-term relations, including creating decent working conditions and centralized provision of the workers' non-labor needs, such as housing, medical care, education, and leisure [3, p. 8-9]. This results in critical decrease of structural prerequisites for the sense of community between workers, as well as for the formation of attachment to a workplace.

Such flexibility and diffusion of the labor relationships blur the boundaries of professional and labor groups, confuse their self-identification, and compromise solidarity [4]. One can suggest that in this situation local labor communities will gradually lose their integrative function. For studying these processes, a conceptual framework describing the connection between interpersonal communications and social structure is needed. Here we aim to evaluate the relevance of the theories by M. Granovetter, S. Eisenstadt, and A. Honneth for studying integration processes in local labor communities.

**Analysis of recent researches.** The latest trends in sociological theorizing show a decline in fundamental theory development: thus, an analysis of recent scientific publications in Ukrainian and international periodicals showed only minor occurrence of articles developing large-scale theories, methodologies, or their classification<sup>1</sup>. Such trends appear due to the complications of the comprehensive analysis of the contemporary society, as well as the inner logic of development of sociology as an institutionalized discipline and a social activity [5]. However, we argue that the analysis of global processes may and should benefit from relying on a large-scale comprehensive theoretical framework of interpreting connections between individuals and social structures through all the levels of organization of society.

The latest rise of the "grand theories" in sociology has been observed in the last third of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, which is very recently in the terms of the development of the knowledge structures. Thus, most of the contemporary middle-range theories and empirical frameworks are rooted in them and may be better understood with their fundamental prerequisites [6]. At the same time, there have been significant transformations in society brought about in the 21<sup>st</sup> century by the extensive economic globalization powered by digital communication technologies, improvement of spatial mobility, and automation of labor. These processes, referred to as "digitalization of society", are being actively studied (see, for example [7]), and regarded as highly relevant for the society as a high abstract level entity [8], as well as in the context of national societies [e.g. 9; 10] and various spheres of social and economic activity [11; 12; 13; 14]. Theories developed before the profoundness of such changes became visible should be applied to the contemporary society with caution, as they may not account for the relevant new forms and practices of interactions that emerge respectively.

Based on such considerations, the scope of this article is turned towards the theories conceived and developed during the last third of the 20<sup>th</sup> century by the researchers of differing national, academic, and generational background. Similar theses in their theories are compared and combined in search of the underlying notions that one could use to analyze integration processes in local labor communities in contemporary Europe. It is suggested that due to the economic nature of the globalization the labor market is where the social change is initiated, either intentional or unintentional [8]. Research on the effects of the accelerated digitalization explore, among most frequent topics, social effects of the dissemination of remote working practices, new axes of the unequal distribution of the workload and income, and how they correlate with the traditional inequalities [15]. Special attention is paid to the issue of social effects of the accelerated labor market digitalization in the context of the Ukrainian society because of the combined crisis of pandemic and war causing major displacement of population [16]. Still, the fundamental principles steering transformation processes in local labor communities remain underinvestigated.

**The purpose of the article.** Considering the above, the article is aimed to analyze the potential of using the outlined theories (those by M. Granovetter, S. Eisenstadt, and A. Honneth) as a conceptual framework for studying integration processes in local labor communities.

**Presentation of the theoretical research.** M. Granovetter suggests studying interpersonal relationships using graph theory and forming a graph whose nodes represent people and edges are ties between them. Using this approach, any group of people can be represented as a social network and analyzed through mathematical models. An important characteristic of the tie is its strength – a combination of the amount of time, the emotional intensity, the intimacy (mutual confiding), and the reciprocal services [17, p. 1361]. The researcher doesn't analyze the functioning of the elements of the tie's strength or their weights, but investigates the influence of the tie's strength on the formation of social structure. According to him, the ties do not gain their strength randomly and independently: for example, two people having a strong tie with the third person will most likely have a strong connection as well, while weak ties tend to connect members of unrelated groups. Configuration of strong, weak and absent ties determines the structure of the social network [17, p. 1362-1363]. Thus, qualitative features of an interpersonal tie combine to define its strength that influences further formation of the relations structure in the

---

<sup>1</sup> The analysis was conducted by the author and included issues of the Ukrainian specialized editions in sociology published since 2019 and online search of English language scientific publications in sociology within the same time frame by keywords grand theory, "fundamental theory", "comprehensive analysis", "social structure", "social theory history", etc.

units of potentially unlimited size. M. Granovetter himself uses this model in research, among other things, of the diffusion of information worldwide.

S. Eisenstadt studies personal relations (friendship, patron-client relations, ritual kinship, pseudo-kinship, and others) and their role in the formation of the sense of community and social norms. He places an emphasis on two most essential features of these relationships: voluntariness of the connection, meaning independent choice of partnership, and the consequent ability to connect people regardless of gender, age, race/nationality, class, etc. [18]. Due to these features, personal relationships have a twofold nature: on the one hand, they are informal, particularistic, and involve one's unique personality through deep emotional attachment; on the other hand, they are still largely bound by the social constraints, universalized, and can serve as proxies for social order. These relations are usually characterized with mutual intimacy, moral and emotional obligations (trust and empathy above all), the sharing of common "pure" pristine values, and some equality (even in the essentially hierarchical patron-client relations, which imply moral equality of the participants abiding to the same norms) [18, p. 2].

A. Honneth analyzes personal relations through the optics of recognition processes which he describes as an attitude characterized by the ascription of significance to, and the moral reasoning of, the specific unique features of a person, as well as by regarding them while planning one's activity. He distinguishes between the three levels of recognition processes which differ in modes and objects of recognition. Modes and objects of recognition are the aspects of personality involved in the process. A person can perform recognition through intuition (affective aspect), concept (cognitive aspect), and intellectual intuition (rational affect). Possible objects are an individual (one's concrete needs), a person (one's formal autonomy), or a subject (one's individual particularity) [19, p. 25]. Primary recognition concerns affective aspects and concrete individual needs; it is performed through intuition and takes the form of love [19, p. 95-96]. The relationships in primary groups (friends and family) are the source of this type of recognition. A special significance in this sense is attached to the parent-child relationships since they become the first experience of recognition relations for a person and affect all such relations during lifetime. On the basis of the primary recognition, a person develops trust to themselves, the ability to trust others, the image of self and own place in life, according to which further relations are formed. The abuse of recognition on this stage results in problems of the person's social integration [19, p. 103-104].

In all three research perspectives interpersonal relationships represent the primary unit of community which involves a person through emotional activity and engagement. On the level of social institutions, a person becomes involved in relations as a member of a group, i.e. through the position in the system of connections. Thus, the network of interpersonal relationships affects the structure of relationships between larger social units; and at the same time the order of structuring these relationships preconditions formation of personal connections with certain partners in certain form.

Researchers offer different approaches to describe this mutual influence between interpersonal relationships and social order. The structural aspects of such influence are highlighted in the social network analysis, which was originally used by M. Granovetter to underline the way social and economic activities are mixed up with networks of social relations [20, p. 113]. He calls this feature "embeddedness" and suggests taking social networks as a middle level between larger cultural, political, and economic phenomena on the macro-level and individual interactions on the micro-level. Social networks serve as an intermediate level connecting micro- and macro- together. Social network analysis is a tool to capture the point "where cooperation and trust and domination and compliance are actually produced, and those are crucial parts of every socio-economic system" [20, p. 116].

The structure of social networks affects collective behavior, diffusion of information and innovations, and social change through it all. M. Granovetter introduces threshold models of collective behavior suggesting that such grand-scale social phenomena as rioting, voting, migration, and education attainment are defined by the mutual influence of individual choices [21]. His approach is based on the application of mathematical methods (graph theory, game theory) to model systemic interdependence of multiple elements and to compute the results. Thus, he takes into account both the definitive role of the micro-level phenomena and processes and the non-linear dependence of the social institutions and change on the individual interactions, the impossibility to reduce the society as a whole to separate actors.

S. Eisenstadt focuses on culture, which is defined by the specific patterns of the interpersonal relations within the respective community and at the same time serves as an environment for such relations, a necessary condition of their establishment in a certain form. He dedicates his work to the empirical research of how trust, cooperation, and domination / submission are established in the immediate relationships in different cultures [18, p. 43-47]. He is interested in both the existing diversity of cultural patterns regarding the formation of such relationships and the historical development of civilizations. The type of civilization influences the functioning of trust on the micro-level, which, in turn, defines the structure of trust in society and the development of social change. The notion of cultural diversity and historical development of cultures, axial time and axial civilizations plays an important role in his concept of modernization. According to him, modernization process takes on a respective trajectory and connotation within a certain culture [22, pp. 47-72]. Thus, S. Eisenstadt's approach is based on the analysis of the gradual historical development of the societies according to their own internal logic,

which is based on the sustainable transfer of the foundational principles of the relationships of trust and domination / submission from the individual interactions to social institutions and backward. In this regard, orientation to universalism / particularism represents an important characteristic of civilization in his theory since it is capable of changing the balance between the personal and the social [23].

This balance is represented somewhat differently in A. Honneth's work. He expands the principles of recognition processes from interpersonal to group connections, suggesting the notion of the three levels of recognition processes, and underlines the importance of interpersonal recognition relations in understanding social relations. Recognition processes on the three levels are fundamentally similar: the essence of the process is the same, and different levels of interaction are formed due to the diversity of modes and objects of recognition. The processes on different levels intersect and consistently continue each other coming to be essentially interconnected [19, p. 129].

At different levels recognition takes the form of love, rights, and solidarity and influences the formation of the relevant aspects of personality. On the first level, self-confidence and trust to others are formed through the love accepted and given. On the second level, people act as participants of organized exchange, first of all, commodity exchange, and recognition takes a legal form of the recognition of rights. Self-respect is built through the awareness of one's own civil rights and the respect for the similar rights of others. The third level implies the unity of values of the morally autonomous subjects and orientation to common laws and evaluation criteria. Self-esteem is built based on this form of recognition, which is solidarity. An important feature of this form of recognition is trust represented as recognition of the counterpart's moral autonomy and their ability to make reasonable decisions regarding moral standards [24]. This thesis is close to S. Eisenstadt's notion of equality in interpersonal relations.

Reciprocity of recognition is fundamentally important since it defines a human's personality and their place in the respective relationships [25, pp. 197-206]. This means reciprocal manifestations of love, mutual recognition of rights, and symmetric evaluation according to the values, which are significant in the context of common activity. In the relation of solidarity, the key aspect is active involvement in the individual features of the personality of each participant [24]. In this case, recognition isn't necessarily connected with positive estimation; the attribution of significance through the orientation of one's activity is far more important. In this regard, A. Honneth distinguishes between misrecognition as disregard to the respective aspects of counterpart's personality, and disrecognition as complete social invisibility of the object. For him, the involvement in the recognition relations serves as a criterion of both individual and social manifestations of a person: only in such relationships can one actualize himself as a human, obtain and reveal individuality, and perform freedom [25, pp. 197-206].

Despite the difference in the approaches and in the elements of social relations, which are in the focus of attention in the respective theories, it is possible to outline a number of aspects of such relations which all the three researchers consider significant.

1. Trust. For M. Granovetter, mutual confiding is an element of the strength of a tie, which influences the structure of social networks and, in the end, all grand-scale social phenomena. He includes trust as a necessary element of any socioeconomic system, which is essential to start interaction, and argues that it is actually produced on the level of interpersonal relationships in social networks. S. Eisenstadt analyses trust as a basic feature of informal interpersonal relationships, and the structure of trust – as a defining characteristic of a civilization affecting the cultural environment of social and political processes. Orientation to universalism / particularism, which he includes as one of the primary characteristics of a civilization, regards specifically the principles of trust establishment. In the theory by A. Honneth, trust accompanies recognition processes at all the three levels: at the first level it is formed as an ability that later defines the specificities of social integration; and further develops to become a unity of values manifested as trust toward the other as a morally autonomous subject.

2. Involvement, or active recognition of the counterpart's social significance. In the theory by M. Granovetter it takes the form of reciprocal services, which, same as trust, are the element of the strength of a tie; and also, it is revealed in the mechanisms of collective behavior in the form of orientation of own strategy to the choices of others. For S. Eisenstadt involvement is a primary feature of interpersonal relationships; it is revealed in the form of moral and emotional obligations between the participants, as well as in the form of the establishment of cooperation. A. Honneth analyses active involvement as a ground for recognition processes; it serves as a medium for symmetrical evaluation, characterizing actually social interaction.

3. Domination / submission relations and the establishment of compliance. All the three researchers agree that domination / submission relations derive from interpersonal interaction and then transfer into institutional relations. Compliance here serves as a necessary basis for social order and can take the form of either active freewill compliance or the result of power relations. M. Granovetter takes it as a mutual influence of the subjects, especially regarding the choice of action – thus, this choice is free since it is made individually and at the same time socially determined since it is oriented to others. It is the configuration of social networks, structuring this mutual influence, which plays the key role in the production of domination and compliance. S. Eisenstadt puts the questions of domination, submission, and equality in the center of his research. Interpersonal relationships constituted in a certain way represent the basis for the mechanisms of production, transmission, and transformation

of social order. Special meaning is ascribed to such form of compliance as moral equality, meaning orientation to the same norms, which clearly echoes the concept of relations of solidarity of A. Honneth, whose theory views a single moral criterion as a feature of the highest level of reciprocal recognition. Herewith, it is the need for reciprocity of recognition that determines the interrelation between domination and submission, as well as the distribution of rights to use certain goods. Therefore, demonstration of recognition or disrecognition serves as an exercise of power, as an act of struggle for power; and the struggle for recognition comes to be actually social struggle.

It is important to pay attention to the interrelation between domination, submission, and compliance given in the respective theories. For M. Granovetter compliance appears to be a product, a result of relations in social networks; it is "produced" in interpersonal interaction, established due to the mutual influence of individuals, and it is necessary for the consequent levels of integration. In the theory by A. Honneth compliance in the form of reciprocity of recognition underlies any social interaction and serves as a prerequisite of the process of establishing balance between domination and submission, as a certain "balance point" in the relations of mutual interdependence of the dominant and the subordinate. S. Eisenstadt takes domination, submission, and equality as different modes of functioning of trust being an essential feature of a relationship. Thus, "the establishment of compliance" in the three theories means, respectively, its "emergence", "enacting", and "practicing". Analyzing them altogether, it is reasonable to argue that such approaches reflect different aspects of the dynamic social process.

The examined common elements of the theories also constitute the interconnected consequence describing the social process: *trust* acts as a ground for a contact; *involvement* – as an active manifestation, materialization of the contact; *compliance* – as validation of the relation in a certain form and as a basis for further trust.

Having the discussed common elements, the approaches can be combined; in this regard, it is necessary to take into account the differences in their scope. As it was stated before, M. Granovetter leaves the specificities of interpersonal interaction out of his scope, skipping on the possibilities to operationalize and calculate the weights of the elements of the strength of a tie. The approaches of S. Eisenstadt and A. Honneth allow extending the notion of processes at this level of social interactions: S. Eisenstadt focuses his attention on the forms and modes of practicing trust, proximity, and kinship, while A. Honneth adjusts G.H. Mead's theory of self for exploring the mechanisms of primary recognition processes [19, p. 71]. It may seem that both researchers miss out the middle level proceeding from interpersonal interactions to grand-scale social processes, by contrast to M. Granovetter, for whom the meso-level of social networks lies in the center of attention. S. Eisenstadt puts the question about the structure of trust in society, which is interconnected with individual trust, and A. Honneth's notion of the essential unity of the recognition processes at different levels explains the consistency of such transition. A. Honneth elaborates the question of the middle level through the analysis of "I" and "We" balance [26]. However, the method suggested by M. Granovetter enhances this transition with actually structural aspects due to the detailed research of the structure of social networks.

**Conclusions.** Since the discussed researchers underline similar aspects of the social relationships in analyzing the interrelation between interpersonal relationships and social structure, it is possible to integrate their theories into a single conceptual framework. In their scope, the connection between interpersonal relationships and social structure appears actually processual; it is continually reproduced with certain variability. Changes start from the lower levels, yet their influence on the higher levels is not linear; moreover, interpersonal interactions are largely determined by the structural properties of the environment, although neither of the influences is characterized by rigid determination. Different scopes suggested by the researchers complement each other, which allow elaborating an integrated notion of the social integration processes.

No contradictions are found between the theories since they all implement a notion of the mutual influence of the different levels of social integration. This is the way the researchers respond to the demand for synthetic theories, which gained relevance in the last third of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, when they started investigating the topic. Using the complex approach for studying transformations of local labor communities allows tracing the connection between social integration in local labor communities and grand-scale social change, the mechanisms of introduction of this change into the local labor communities and labor relationships in general. Besides that, it explains the significance of the process, which is not limited to only the sphere of labor. Moreover, this approach can be used as a basis for empirical research of the new grounds for social integration, which substitute labor's integrative function under the conditions of contemporary transformations of labor relationships.

In addition, it is important to notice that the discussed theories do not imply the necessary locality of the social process: trust, involvement, and compliance can evolve not only in face-to-face relationships, but also in remote and virtual interaction without connection to physical presence. Though these authors develop their theories prior to the era of globalization characterized by the inconsistencies between physical and social topology, they are relevant for studying social transformations resulting from it.

Further theoretical developments on the topic should concern the investigation of the dispersion range of change, which may occur in the reproduction of social order, as well as the possible specificities of social integration processes in the interpersonal relations formed in the context of labor. Empirical research might be

aimed at the evaluation of the effects of the labor relationships transformations on the overall solidarity in society and the analysis of changes (if any) in the basic principles of the formation of trust, involvement, and compliance. Cross-disciplinary research can clarify such aspects of social integration processes, as the essential components of trust, involvement, and compliance on the interpersonal level and their significance for the social structure (with social psychology), the possibility of the intentional social change started from the interpersonal level as a form of power (with political science), and the balance between intentionality and contingency in social change (with social philosophy).

Received 03.09.2022

Accepted 01.11.2022

#### References:

1. Rifkin, J. (1995) *The end of work: the decline of the global labor force and the dawn of the post-market era*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.
2. Bauman, Z. (2001) 'The rise and fall of labor', *The Individualized Society*, p. 17-30.
3. Bauman, Z. (1998) *Globalization: The Human Consequences*. Columbia University Press.
4. Makeiev, S. (2021) 'The varying modality of social self-positioning' in Vorona, V., Shulga, M. (eds) *The Ukrainian Society: monitoring of social change. 30 YEARS OF INDEPENDENCE. Issue 8 (22)*, Kyiv: Institute of Sociology NAS of Ukraine, pp. 201-218 [in Ukrainian]
5. Golikov, A. (2020). 'The Problem of Theorizing On / Of Sociology and Problematization of Sociological Theory', *Visnyk of V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, Series "Sociological Studies of Contemporary Society: Methodology, Theory, Methods"*, 45, 7-15. <https://doi.org/10.26565/2227-6521-2020-45-01>
6. Gamper, M. (2022) 'Social Network Theories: An Overview' in Klärner, A. et al. (eds.) *Social Networks and Health Inequalities: A New Perspective for Research*. Springer Nature Switzerland AG. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-97722-1>
7. Reis, J., Amorim, M., Melão, N., Cohen, Y., Rodrigues, M. (2020) 'Digitalization: A Literature Review and Research Agenda' in Anisic, Z., Lalic, B., Gracanin, D. (eds) *Proceedings on 25th International Joint Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management – IJCIEOM*. Springer, Cham. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-43616-2\\_47](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-43616-2_47)
8. Grybauskas, A., Stefanini, A., Ghobakhloo, M. (2022) 'Social sustainability in the age of digitalization: A systematic literature review on the social implications of Industry 4.0', *Technology in Society*, 70, article 101997. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2022.101997>
9. Tabarés, R., Bartolome Campino, T., García Valbuena, J. (2022) 'Challenges and opportunities of maker culture for the digitalization of Spanish society', *Sociology and Technoscience*, 12(2), 206-227. DOI 10.24197/st.2.2022.206-227
10. Kulueva, C., Ubaidullayev, M., Ismanaliev, K., Kuznetsov, V., Romanovskaya, E. (2020) 'Digitalization of Kyrgyz Society: Challenges and Prospects' in Popkova, E., Sergi, B. (eds) *The 21st Century from the Positions of Modern Science: Intellectual, Digital and Innovative Aspects*. ISC 2019. Lecture Notes in Networks and Systems, vol 91. Springer, Cham. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-32015-7\\_26](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-32015-7_26)
11. Tombe, R., Smuts, H. (2023) 'Society 5.0-Inspired Digitalization Framework for Resilient and Sustainable Agriculture' in Gerber, A., Hinkelmann, K. (eds.), *Society 5.0 2023 (EPiC Series in Computing, vol. 93, ISSN: 2398-7340)*, 216–227. Available at: [https://www.easychair.org/publications/volume/Society\\_5.0\\_2023](https://www.easychair.org/publications/volume/Society_5.0_2023)
12. Lindgren, I., Østergaard Madsen, C., Hofmann, S., Melin, U. (2019) 'Close encounters of the digital kind: A research agenda for the digitalization of public services', *Government Information Quarterly*, 36(3), p. 427-436. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2019.03.002>
13. Ahel, O., Lingenu, K. (2020) 'Opportunities and Challenges of Digitalization to Improve Access to Education for Sustainable Development in Higher Education' in Leal Filho, W., et al. *Universities as Living Labs for Sustainable Development*, World Sustainability Series. Springer, Cham. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-15604-6\\_21](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-15604-6_21)
14. Knudsen, D.-R. (2020) 'Elusive boundaries, power relations, and knowledge production: A systematic review of the literature on digitalization in accounting', *International Journal of Accounting Information Systems*, 36, article 100441. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.accinf.2019.100441>
15. Choudhury, P., Foroughi, C., Zepp Larson, B. (2020) 'Work-from-Anywhere: The Productivity Effects of Geographic Flexibility', *Academy of Management Proceedings 2020(1)*. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMBPP.2020.225>
16. Chepurko, G. (2022) 'Labor Market in Ukraine: Current Challenges and Risks', *Sociology: Theory, Methods, Marketing*, 2022(3), 121-148. [in Ukrainian] <https://doi.org/10.15407/sociology2022.03.121>
17. Granovetter, M. S. (1973) 'The Strength of Weak Ties', *American Journal of Sociology*, 78(6), 1360-1380.
18. Eisenstadt, S. N., Roniger, L. (1984) *Patrons, Clients and Friends: Interpersonal Relations and the Structure of Trust in Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
19. Honneth, A. (1996) *The Struggle for Recognition: The Moral Grammar of Social Conflicts*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
20. Krippner, G., Granovetter, M. et al. (2004) 'Polanyi Symposium: a conversation on embeddedness', *Socio-Economic Review*, 2, 109-135.
21. Granovetter, M. (1978) 'Threshold Models of Collective Behavior', *The American Journal of Sociology*, 83(6), 1420-1443.
22. Eisenstadt, S. N. (1973) *Tradition, Change and Modernity*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
23. Eisenstadt, S. N. (1978) *Revolution and Transformation of Societies: A Comparative Study of Civilizations*. New York: Free Press.

24. Honneth, A. (2004) 'Recognition and Justice: Outline of a Plural Theory of Justice', *Acta Sociologica*, 47 (4) "Recognition, Redistribution, and Justice", 351-364.
25. Honneth, A. (1992) 'Moral Development and Social Struggle: Hegel's Early Social-Philosophical Doctrines' in Honneth, A., McCarthy, T., Offe, C., Wellmer, A. (eds) *Cultural-Political Interventions in the Unfinished Project of Enlightenment*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London: The MIT Press.
26. Honneth, A. (2012) *The I in We: Studies in the Theory of Recognition*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

---

## ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ ПРОЦЕСІВ ІНТЕГРАЦІЇ У ЛОКАЛЬНИХ ТРУДОВИХ СПІЛЬНОТАХ: МІЖ МІЖОСОБИСТІСНИМИ ВІДНОСИНАМИ ТА СОЦІАЛЬНОЮ СТРУКТУРОЮ (НА БАЗІ ТЕОРІЙ М. ГРАНОВЕТТЕРА, Ш. АЙЗЕНШТАДТА ТА А. ХОННЕТА)

**Приступа Марія Валеріївна** – магістерка соціології, аспірантка соціологічного факультету, Харківський національний університет імені В. Н. Каразіна, майдан Свободи, 4, Харків, 61022, Україна, e-mail: mariia.prystupa@karazin.ua, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1556-8822>

У статті аналізуються теоретичні положення М. Грановеттера, Ш. Айзенштадта та А. Хоннета про взаємозв'язок між міжособистісними відносинами та соціальною структурою. Підкреслюється, що ці положення можуть бути використані при вивченні трансформаційних процесів у локальних трудових спільнотах в умовах капіталістичної глобалізації та технологічного розвитку, оскільки можна припускати, що в цій ситуації такі спільноти будуть поступово втрачати свою інтеграційну функцію. Підходи, запропоновані обраними авторами, розглядаються з метою визначення елементів соціальних відносин, які зазначені науковці вважають найбільш істотними, та зв'язків, які на їхню думку, існують між цими елементами. Аналізується спільне та відмінне у теоріях, що розглядаються, а також можливості їхнього об'єднання в єдину концептуальну рамку. Виокремлюється декілька аспектів соціальних відносин, які всі зазначені дослідники вважають істотними, а саме: довіра, участь (або діяльнісне визнання іншого як соціально значущого), відносини влади / підкорення та встановлення згоди. Акцентується взаємозв'язок цих аспектів, формулюється висновок про те, що розглянуті теорії, об'єднані в єдину концептуальну рамку, можуть бути застосовані при дослідженні соціальної інтеграції, зокрема в локальних трудових спільнотах. Доводиться, що різні фокуси уваги, запропоновані М. Грановеттером, Ш. Айзенштадтом та А. Хоннетом, у такій оптиці лише доповнюють один одного, що дозволяє отримати комплексне уявлення про зазначені процеси. Стверджується, що запропонована концептуальна рамка є адекватною для вивчення трансформацій, що відбуваються внаслідок розбіжностей між фізичною та соціальною топологією. Визначаються перспективи подальших досліджень з обраної проблематики, в тому числі присвячених аналізу впливу вищезазначених процесів на солідарність у трудових спільнотах та їхню соціальну та політичну суб'єктність, а також співвідношенню інтенціональності та закономірності в соціальних змінах.

**Ключові слова:** локальні трудові спільноти, Марк Грановеттер, Шмуель Айзенштадт, Аксель Хоннет, міжособистісні відносини, соціальна структура, соціальна інтеграція, інтеграційна функція праці.

---

Отримано 03.09.2022

Прийнято до друку 01.11.2022